skill in the art would have used three detectors spaced at P/n in order to sample the useful portions of the spectra (column 5, lines 45+).

2. Claim 7 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pratt and Ackerman et al as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Rinaudo and Schwartz (US 3,612,691).

Pratt and Ackerman do not show the feedback control of the laser intensity. Rinaudo shows a system for intensity feedback control of a laser. At the time of the invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have combined Pratt and Ackerman with Rinaudo in order to better control the laser by controlling both wavelength and intensity. Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have used the teachings of Schwartz that the sum of the detected signals is proportional to the intensity of the incident beam for use as the power feedback signal of Rinaudo.

3. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pratt as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of the prior art disclosed by applicant.

Pratt does not show the choosing of one of a number of UTI standard operating wavelengths, however the choosing of one of a number of UTI standard operating wavelengths is well know as admitted by the applicant. At the time of the invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have chosen one of a number of UTI standard operating wavelengths for the wavelength tuning in order to meet the UTI standard.

4. Claims 20-24, and 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell (US 6,151,114) in view of Schwartz .

Russell shows a coherent laser warning system comprising:

producing a periodic optical interference pattern by illuminating an optical element with the light output by the laser;

detecting at least three different portions of the periodic optical interference pattern to generate at least three respective detection signals.

Russell does not show the generating a power signal indicative of output power from the laser using the at least three detection signals.

Schwartz shows a monochromaticity detector using an etalon to obtain an interferogram wherein Swartz teaches that the sum of all the signals is proportional to the intensity of the incident light (column 2, lines 61+).

At the time of the invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have summed the detected signals in order to ascertain the intensity of the incident light.

2. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell in view of Schwartz as applied to claim 20 above, further in view of Chang.

Russell and Schwartz do not show the interference pattern being reflected. Chang shows the use of a reflector to reflect the interference pattern. At the time of the invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have used a reflector to reflect the interference pattern since the skill artisan would recognize that folding the path by using a mirror allows flexibility in the arrangement of the parts thus enabling a different sized apparatus.